



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*the Holy Land* (a second edition of which appeared in 1898), and *Ad-Dourra al-Fakhira*. In the volume before us, which does not claim to be a contribution to the science of geography, he gives an interesting account of a tour around the Dead Sea which he made in the month of March, 1899. His itinerary was as follows: Jerusalem, Hebron, Engedi, Masada, the Slime Pits of Es-Sebkha at the south end of the Dead Sea, Ghor es-Sâfiyeh, Dera', Libb, Ma'in, Madeba, Mashitta, Mount Nebo, Jericho, and back to Jerusalem.

His dragoman he had had before in 1893-94. Two sheikhs of the Jehalin Arabs escorted him from Hebron to Kerak. Fortune favored him and his caravan in crossing the Slime Pits of Es-Sebkha; for others have not been able to make it, as did our author, in two and one-half hours. Jebel Usdum, which suggests the name of ancient Sodom, he thinks to have come from the Bible or the Koran, rather than to have been handed down four thousand years. The Dead Sea is said to be rising (p. 46). The Turkish government at Kerak is praised for establishing peace and order. The missionaries of the C. M. S. are commended for their tact and ability, as is also Dr. Pater-son, of Hebron. The palace at Mashitta is supposed by our author to date from the end of the sixth or the commencement of the seventh century A. D.

At the close of the volume is attached as an appendix the author's article entitled "Dead Sea," contributed to and already published in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and which is a well-written and comprehensive epitome of the facts—geological, biblical, and historical—known about that very interesting and unique body of water. A complete bibliography of the literature on the subject closes the volume.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

THE MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

GOLGOTHA UND DAS HEILIGE GRAB ZU JERUSALEM. VON CARL MOMMERT. Leipzig: Haberland, 1900. Pp. 280. M. \$5.50.

THIS volume must have cost its author a vast amount of study and labor. All available authorities—his list shows one hundred and seventy-two authors—have been consulted, and we have as a result an elaborate compilation to prove the writer's thesis, namely, the authenticity of the Holy Sepulcher as the place of the crucifixion and burial of Christ. The evidence brought forward for this is contained practically in the first chapter, embracing only twenty pages, the remainder

of the volume being occupied with a history of the church since the time of Constantine. The word "church" here used embraces the various sacred spots now grouped in one locality. Each of the nineteen chapters treats of a separate topic, all having a certain interest, for example: "The Different Names of the Place of Christ's Death, as Golgotha, the Skull, Calvaria, and Several Others" (ii); "The Cleft in the Rock of Golgotha" (x); "Extent of the Surface of the Still Existing Rock" (viii); "Chapel of Modestus and the Crusaders" (v); "The Chapel of Adam" (xi); "Total Destruction of the Tomb in A. D. 1010" (xvii); "Destruction of the Church in A. D. 1808" (xix). Space prevents us from giving the entire list.

The success or failure of the author's theory must be decided by what is contained in the first chapter, which is entitled "The Location of Golgotha." Dr. Mommert has, of course, no more evidence than exists. The evidence which he brings forward has been presented many times before him, and it is identical with that presented by every advocate of the traditional sites.

It is universally admitted that on the site of the present Holy Sepulcher certain buildings—a rotunda over the supposed tomb of Christ, and a grand basilica farther to the east—were erected by order of Constantine. It was three hundred years (for convenience say 30 A. D. to 330 A. D.) after the death of Christ when these were built, and it is claimed that they marked the identical places where our Lord was crucified and buried. The proper question to ask is: What evidence existed at the time which led to the selection of these places? This question is not raised as a new one, but as one which the advocates of the traditional sites ought to answer. Writing an elaborate history of the church since 330 A. D. does not answer it; that is comparatively an easy task. No one denies that in 326 A. D., Helena, Constantine's mother, an old lady—she died in 328—shortly after she had embraced Christianity visited Jerusalem, and while there, this is alleged, the sites were discovered. Later historians assert that she chose these points in consequence of a dream she had about the three crosses. The historian who lived at the time, Eusebius, who died in 340 A. D., does not mention this circumstance. The event was one of very great importance, and if in 326 evidence existed which led to the selection of these places, why did writers of ecclesiastical history who lived seventy-five years later omit all mention of that evidence and ascribe their location to a dream? Some advocates of the traditional theory declare that since the year 326 "there is an unbroken

line of testimony as to the genuineness of the site of the Holy Sepulcher." Do such persons understand what they are saying? "The unbroken line of testimony" is to the fact that the Holy Sepulcher has existed since 326 on the spot where it now stands. *This no one disputes.* To assert this and reassert it a thousand times is not to furnish the evidence asked for. To say that additional arguments or facts have been brought to light since 326 A. D. confirming the authenticity of these sites is to state what is absolutely untrue.

The advocates of the traditional site have a right to be heard, and their arguments should receive fair attention. As has been intimated, they all use the same arguments, with a slight difference perhaps in the statement of them. Of this class of persons Dr. Mommert may be considered a fair representative, and the following is a summary of his case as he presents it. The words in quotations and in italics, with which each proposition begins, are Dr. Mommert's own :

a. "*It is beyond doubt*" that the place of the crucifixion and burial of Christ was known to his immediate followers.

b. "*It is beyond doubt*" that the place was not lost sight of by the building of Agrippa's wall three or four years before his death.

c. "*It is beyond doubt*" that the place was not lost sight of during the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, 70 A. D.

d. "*It is beyond doubt*" that the site was known in the time of Hadrian (he died in 138 A. D.).

e. "*It is certain*" that the site was not lost by the efforts of Hadrian to obliterate all traces of the locality.

These five points, if we exclude the contemporaries of Christ from the first one, are precisely what we ask to have proved. Dr. Mommert furnishes no proof, no other advocate of the traditional sites has ever furnished any proof; the simple fact is that no proof exists. Dr. Mommert and others of his class put forth these points as arguments and say, "therefore the site is authentic." It is a curious way of reasoning: (1) the place ought to have been known; (2) the place probably was known; (3) the place was well known. Why do not the advocates of the traditional site admit at the outset, as everybody must admit, that for three hundred years there is an absolute blank, so far as any history or evidence is concerned bearing on its authenticity? Historical accuracy demands that such a declaration be made. The first bit of historical light we get is from Eusebius, that the finding of the tomb (a tomb) "was contrary to all expectation." The only natural inference is that the place was not previously known. The advocates of the site say "the place was well known;" Eusebius, writing

from personal knowledge, says that the place was found "contrary to all expectation." It is not possible to reconcile these statements.

In regard to the fifth point, Dr. Mommert takes it for granted that "efforts were made by Hadrian to obliterate all traces of the locality." He ought to have stated, what is the fact, that there is no historical evidence for any such alleged efforts. He states it as a fact that Hadrian built a temple to Venus on the spot. Eusebius, however, does not say this, or even imply it.

The advocates of the traditional site constantly assert that the place "was made a dumping ground," and that "a temple of Venus was erected upon it." Both cannot be true; we have a right to demand that they give up either the dump-heap or the Venus temple.

To some minds the claim is no doubt a very plausible one that the place of Christ's burial could not have been lost, that it was always well known. His relatives would be the most likely to remember it, but they lived in Nazareth or Capernaum. After a while Joseph, who made the tomb, or his family, would need it for themselves. Are there not in our own country some important historical events the scenes of which it has been found impossible to locate after the lapse of one hundred and fifty or two hundred years? In the case we are considering three hundred years elapsed. And how different the conditions! With us, one people, the same interests and pursuits, and uninterrupted peace; in the other case, frightful commotions, revolutions, and upheavals, social, religious, and national. Account must be taken of the many persecutions which the Christians underwent; the clashing of different races and religions in Jerusalem; the terrible destruction under Titus (70 A. D.); the destruction by Bar Cochba of the entire Christian church, which was composed wholly of Hebrews; the ruin and devastation visited upon the city by Hadrian in quelling the second Jewish revolt, when the Jewish population was practically exterminated; the extensive building operations that went on under Hadrian and others—the position of walls changed, broken walls repaired, old houses removed for new ones; for three hundred years is a long time for buildings to last. Changes innumerable took place, and still we are asked to believe that the appearance of Jerusalem in 326 A. D. was about what it was in 33 A. D., and further that, in spite of all these persecutions, banishments, local conflicts, and wars—all this devastation, ruin, and rebuilding—the particular tomb in which Christ was laid was remembered and was "perfectly well known" in 326 A. D. It seems rash to assert that it was so remembered. Such a thing would

have been nothing less than miraculous ; and it is not to be wondered at that the shrewd leaders among the Christians, at the time when the relic craze was becoming rife, should summon to their aid a miracle to justify their act in connecting a certain tomb with the tomb of Christ, which had been irrevocably lost.

SELAH MERRILL.

JERUSALEM, SYRIA.

ÉLÉMENTS D'ARCHÉOLOGIE CHRÉTIENNE. Par HORACE MARUCCHI.  
2 vols. I, Notions générales ; II, Les catacombes romaines.  
Paris : Desclée, Lefebvre & C<sup>ie</sup>, 1900. Pp. xxxvi + 399 ;  
450. Fr. 12.

THESE two volumes of Marucchi's work on Christian archæology have been written in such a fashion that either may be used independently of the other and of a third volume now in preparation. The first volume is a general survey of the field of Christian archæology, so far as it is exemplified in remains in or near Rome. The author seldom goes far afield from the city in this work. The first portion of the book gives a hasty sketch of the persecutions suffered by the Roman church and of its history up to the barbarian invasions. This part of the work is in no way distinguished by new material or new treatment of well-known facts. It is in fact a mediocre performance. The second, and by far the best, division of the volume treats of Christian epigraphy. The hundred pages devoted to this subject are marked by a rigid adherence to conventional divisions of subject-matter, yet, nevertheless, furnish a compact, well-written, and amply illustrated elementary treatise on the subject. It is particularly gratifying to observe that Sig. Marucchi has given so many inscriptions in full and not a few from photographs. The concluding portion of the first volume is occupied by a summary of the history of early Christian art. The subjects depicted in mural paintings and on sarcophagi, rather than the technical and artistic side of the works described, receive attention. Here again we have a convenient manual, but few valuable results of original research.

The second volume is devoted to the catacombs of Rome and the immediate vicinity. It has evidently been prepared as a guide-book for students rather than as an exhaustive treatise. It seems admirably adapted to that purpose. Certainly no other portable work is of such value as this, and it should serve a very useful purpose. Moreover, in this volume the author has used his very extensive knowledge of the